

## I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 21 and 33-48 are canceled in this amendment, without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant notes that since claims 33-48 were subject to a restriction requirement, the Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application with respect to these claims. Claims 1-13, 24-25, 29-32 were previously canceled. Claims 14-19, 23, 26-28, are withdrawn from consideration. New claims 49-62 are added herein. Thus, claims 20, 22, and 49-62 are submitted for consideration herein.

## II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 20, 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (U.S. patent publication 2004/0142742).

The cited portions of Schneider relate to a user identifying himself to a machine using an identification card (Schneider, P26). Once the identification of a player is known, then the player can be presented with an individual payable (Schneider, P43).

Claim 20 recites a “monetary ticket.” A monetary ticket is a ticket assigned a monetary value which is inserted into a machine and the machine is then credited for the monetary value. A player may or may not insert his or her identification (or players) card into the same machine as well, but the identification card and the monetary ticket are two different things. The monetary ticket is a way for the player to fund the wagering activity, whereas the identification is a way for the player to identify himself to the machine. If a player does insert an identification card into a machine, the player would still have to fund the machine (for example by inserting cash or a monetary ticket). Schneider discusses “cash draw tickets” (Schneider, P91) that can be

redeemed at future date for cash prizes during a cash drawing, but these types of tickets are not monetary tickets which are used to fund game play.

Therefore, because of the difference between a monetary ticket and an identification card, an anticipation rejection is improper since a monetary ticket is inherently different than an identification card.

In addition, in order to expedite allowance of the application, further amendments to claim 20 are made to clearly distinguish the invention recited therein.

Claim 20 (as amended) recites, “assigning a first monetary ticket a first ticket value and indicating on the monetary ticket that the monetary ticket triggers a predetermined modified payable;”

Claim 20 (as amended) recites, “assigning to a first monetary ticket both a first ticket value and a predetermined modified payable and indicating on the monetary ticket that the monetary ticket triggers the predetermined modified payable.” Thus, the first monetary ticket is assigned a first ticket value and a predetermined modified payable. The monetary ticket also indicates on the monetary ticket that it triggers the modified payable. For example, the first ticket value can be \$20 (or any other amount) which, if the player inserts the first ticket into a gaming machine, the player would typically be credited \$20.

In Schneider, the identification card itself does not contain a value to use for wagering. Funding for the game would have to come from a source. In Schneider, the identification card may be used to retrieve a player record and then determine a particular payable for the particular patron, the identification card does not itself indicate which payable will be used. In fact, P43 of Schneider states, “Game tables can be changed for a number of reasons.” P44 of Schneider states, “It is also possible to change the payable to the player specific pay table at some times

and not at others.” The player’s identification card does not indicate a predetermined particular payable to be used when inserted, thus Schneider teaches away from using a predetermined modified payable.

In contrast, the monetary ticket of claim 20 indicates that the ticket triggers the predetermined modified payable. Thus, the player would know which payable the monetary ticket would trigger.

Claim 20 (as amended) also recites, “receiving the first monetary ticket in a gaming machine and crediting the first ticket value into the gaming machine to create credited funds; and allowing a player to play a gambling game on the gaming machine using the predetermined modified payable using the credited funds, the predetermined modified payable being different from a default payable on the gaming machine.”

Thus, the amount of the first ticket value is used when the player plays the gambling game. Thus the monetary ticket contains both money to be used for wagering as well as triggers the predetermined modified payable. In Schneider, the identification card is not a payment method. Thus, there is no “first ticket value” disclosed in Schneider.

Claim 20 (as amended) also recites, “receiving a ticket out request on the gaming machine;

issuing a second monetary ticket to the player and assigning both a second ticket value and the predetermined modified payable to the second monetary ticket, the second ticket value reflecting an amount of credits on the gaming machine when the ticket out request was received, and indicating on the second monetary ticket that the second monetary ticket triggers the predetermined modified payable, wherein the second monetary ticket invokes the predetermined modified payable when the player uses the second monetary ticket on a gaming device”

Thus, when the player uses the first monetary ticket and wishes to cash out (for example, the player wishes to go eat and come back to the casino later), the player is then issued a second monetary ticket reflecting an amount of credit on the gaming machine when the ticket out request was received. The second monetary ticket, like the first monetary ticket, triggers the modified payable when the player uses the second monetary ticket on a gaming device.

Without this feature, if the player came into possession of a first monetary ticket which triggers a modified payable and plays for a while and then wishes to take a break, the player may then have to cash out, receive his coins, and then waive his ability to continue to play using the modified payable. Because of the above quoted feature of claim 20, the player can now cash out for the amount of credits on the gaming machine and receive a second monetary ticket that reflects this amount of credits which also triggers the modified payable.

Thus, an advantage of the features recited in claim 20, is that the player can now split his or her play using the predetermined modified payable over different gaming sessions. Thus, the player can start with a first monetary ticket which triggers a modified payable, play on a first machine, then request a ticket out, receive a second monetary ticket, and then take a break (such as have dinner). The player can resume play using the predetermined modified payable using the second monetary ticket since the second monetary ticket is assigned the value of the amount of credits the player had on the first machine when the player requested the ticket out. If the player were just dispensed cash after the first ticket out request, the player could insert that cash into a machine later on but would be presented with the default payable.

Schneider does not discuss receiving a ticket out request and issuing a second monetary ticket, which includes the features as claimed in claim 20. Therefore, claim 20 cannot be anticipated by Schneider.

Further, nothing in Schneider discloses a gaming machine that can issue a second monetary ticket which assigns both a second ticket value and the predetermined modified payable to the second monetary ticket and which also comprises “indicating on the second monetary ticket that the second monetary ticket triggers the predetermined modified payable, wherein the second monetary ticket invokes the predetermined modified payable when the player uses the second monetary ticket on a gaming device.” Having a gaming machine that can issue such a monetary ticket allows for the advantages discussed above.

Further, Claim 20 is not suggested by Schneider either. Schneider is not relevant with regard to payment methods and how payment is made when using the modified payable. There is nothing in Schneider to suggest the features of claim 20, individually or in combination. Therefore, the applicant submits that claim 20 as amended is in condition for allowance.

Claims 22, 49-52 are dependent upon claim 20, which for the above reasons, should be allowed. Claims 22, 49-52 also contain features which should render such claims independently patentable as well.

Claim 22 recites, “restricting use of the first monetary ticket to a particular patron.” This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider, especially since there is no monetary ticket as recited in claim 20.

Claim 49 recites, “wherein the predetermined modified payable becomes unavailable to the player on the gaming machine when the player loses all funds from the first monetary ticket.” This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider.

Claim 50 recites, “wherein the predetermined modified payable becomes unavailable to the player on the gaming device when the player loses all funds from the second monetary ticket. This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider.

Claim 51 recites, “wherein predetermined the modified payable becomes unavailable to the player on the gaming machine after a predetermined amount is played by the player.” This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider.

Claim 52 recites, “wherein the predetermined modified payable becomes unavailable to the player on the gaming machine after a predetermined amount of time has elapsed.” This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider.

Claim 53 recites, “inserting, by the player, cash into the gaming machine; determining, by the gaming machine, that the gaming machine is using the predetermined modified payable and preventing the cash from being wagered using the predetermined modified payable.” This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider.

Claim 54 recites, “wherein the preventing comprises rejecting the cash by returning the cash to the player.” This feature is not taught or suggested in Schneider.

Claims 55-62, in view of the above remarks, are also not taught or suggested by Schneider.

Therefore, in view of the above, allowance of the above claims is respectfully requested.

### III. REQUEST FOR COMPLETE OFFICE ACTION

MPEP 707.07(f) states, “Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it.”

Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that if an Allowance is not issued in response to this Amendment, that each and every argument presented herein be responded to.

The Applicant of course has no reason to believe the Examiner would not have complied with this MPEP requirement anyway, but nevertheless this now becomes important because of the new proposed continuation limitations which are rumored to be enacted soon. If a final rejection is issued, the Applicant will likely appeal, as to which a complete exchange of all arguments will be helpful to both the Applicant and the Board when reviewing the file history.

#### IV. REQUEST FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW

The Applicant hereby attaches an "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form." The Applicant prefers to avoid having to Appeal the outstanding rejection if possible, and thus would appreciate a call from the Examiner if the Examiner decides he is not inclined to allow the Application.

#### V. CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowance is requested.

If there are any issues the Examiner wishes to discuss with the Applicant, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Muskin & Cusick

/Jon H. Muskin #43,824/

Jon. H. Muskin  
Reg. No. 43,824  
Customer # 43,536  
Tel (215) 853-8257